Amendment dated: April 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 19-21 were

amended for purposes of clarity.

The title was rejected as being not descriptive. Claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by what the Office Action indicates as "applicant's

admitted prior art" (hereinafter "AAPA"). Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA.

Figure 3 has been amended to reintroduce connecting arrows pointing from multiplexer

318 to storage element 348 and from multiplexer 320 to storage element 350. These connecting

arrows were present in Figure 3 as originally filed, but were accidentally left off the formalized

drawings.

Objection to the Title

The title of this application was objected to and has been amended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated

by AAPA. AAPA does not teach or suggest a first storage element dedicated to the

first multiplexer and a second storage element dedicated to the second multiplexer, as recited in

67174\_1.DOC

- 10 -

Amendment dated: April 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2005

claims 1, 10, and 19. The storage elements of the AAPA feed into both the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer, receiving data from both the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer.

The Office Action cites the American Heritage<sup>®</sup> Dictionary of the English Language as defining "dedicate" as "to set apart for a special use". The Office Action further states: "Clearly when the first multiplexer is associated with the inactive thread, then storage element 248 is dedicated only to holding pointers from that multiplexer (i.e. it is set aside for special use by the first multiplexer)."

First, storage element 248 is clearly not set apart for a special use by either multiplexer 218 or multiplexer 220, as it is being used by both multiplexers and is therefore not set apart. Thus, the word does not apply to Figure 2 of the AAPA even under the definition used in the Office Action.

Second, the Office Action is defining the verb "dedicate" rather than the adjective "dedicated". The adjective "dedicated" has the following definition in the Encarta® World English Dictionary, North American Edition:

- 2. intended only for one purpose: designed to carry out only one task, or set aside for a purpose
- relayed via a dedicated satellite link

(See Encarta® World English Dictionary, North American Edition).

Neither of these definitions is applicable to storage element 248 of Figure 2 of the AAPA. Storage element 248 is not set aside for the purpose of multiplexer 218 or multiplexer 220, it will receive data indirectly sent from either of these multiplexers.

Amendment dated: April 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2005

Third, the Office Action's application of the word "dedicated" to the structure shown in Figure 2 is not consistent as it is used in the art. Rather, it is actually the exact opposite. Storage element 248 is what is referred to in the art as a shared storage element. A shared storage element is used by multiple devices, just as storage element 248 is used by both multiplexer 218 and multiplexer 220. The opposite of a shared storage element is a dedicated storage element.

For all of these reasons, AAPA does not teach or suggest a first storage element dedicated to the first multiplexer and a second storage element dedicated to the second multiplexer, as claimed in claims 1, 10, and 19. Claims 2-4, 9, 11-13, 18, and 20-21 depend from claims 1, 10, and claim 19, respectively. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA. As stated above, elements of claims 1, 10, and 19 are neither shown nor suggested by AAPA. Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 09/753,764 Amendment dated: April 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2005

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

**KENYON & KENYON** 

Dated: April 13, 2005

Stephen T. Neal

(Reg. No. 47,815)

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON 333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone:

(408) 975-7500

Facsimile:

(408) 975-7501

Amendment dated: April 13, 2005

Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2005

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS** 

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figure 3. Connecting arrows

pointing from multiplexer 318 to storage element 348 and from multiplexer 320 to storage

element 350 have been reintroduced to Figure 3. These connecting arrows were present in

Figure 3 as originally filed, but were accidentally left off the formalized drawings.

Four (4) pages of Replacement drawings are attached and replace any previous drawings

submitted.

Attachment: Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Replacement Sheets

67174\_1.DOC

-9-

